APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,536	04/11/2006	Thomas Busse	851.0005.U1(US)	8934

29683   7590   04/14/2009
HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC
4 RESEARCH DRIVE, Suite 202
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, QUYNH H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2614	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/14/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/575,536	BUSSE, THOMAS
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	QUYNH H. NGUYEN	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>amendment filed 1/29/09</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-6,15,16 and 19-28</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-6,15,16 and 19-28</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail. Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can
be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   Claims 1, 3-6, 15-16, 20, and 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being
anticipated by Kammer (US 7,356,347).

        As to claim 1, Kammer teaches a computer implemented method comprising:
sending a service request from a first device (*initiator device*) to a second device
(*responding device*) (abstract; Fig. 7A; col. 11, lines 36-38); and receiving, from the
second device, a response message comprising a user-friendly name for the second
device (abstract; Fig. 7A; col. 11, lines 38-41 and lines 45-49).

        As to claim 3, Kammer teaches the first device is an application host (col. 8, lines
66 through col. 9, line 2) and it is inherent that the second device is application client.

        As to claim 4, Kammer teaches the service search request is a request relating to
a first service record stored in a database of the second device (col. 11, lines 41-49).

        As to claim 5, Kammer teaches the second device sends attributes of the
requested first service record (col. 11, lines 39-47, col. 12, lines 23-32).

        As to claim 20, Kammer teaches the service search request comprises an
identification of a corresponding application and the response message comprises the
identification of the corresponding application (col. 4, lines 32-43).

As to claim 22, Kammer teaches displaying on the first device the user-friendly name for the second device (col. 4, lines 43-44; col. 11, lines 47-49).

As to claim 23, Kammer teaches the response message is in response to the service search request (col. 11, lines 36-44).

As to claim 24, Kammer teaches the service search request comprises a Bluetooth service search request message (col. 11, lines 29-38).

As to claim 25, Kammer teaches the response message comprises a plurality of attributes including one attribute comprising the user-friendly name for the second device (Fig. 7B; col. 12, lines 23-32).

Claims 6, 15-16, and 26-28 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Kammer teaches a memory storing computer program (col. 6, lines 24-48), a transceiver (Fig. 3, *Bluetooth wireless transceiver 208*) to send service search request, a memory to store user-friendly name for second device (col. 11, lines 19-25).

3.   Claims 1, 6, 15-16 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Benq Corporation (AWL-100 User Manual) page 13, hereinafter Benq Corporation.

Claims 1, 6, 15-16, and 26-28 are very broad that any applications would read on the claims. For example, when one make a request form his / her computer to search for nearby wireless network, a list of neighboring network names or user-friendly names will displayed on his/her computer. Another example is Benq Corporation user manual

page 13, as to claim 1, Benq Corporation teaches: the first device makes a service

search request (*a user using his/her laptop computer makes a scan request for*

available Access Points in his/her neighborhood); the second device (*another access*

point of another user) receives search request and sends at least an attribute identifying

a user-friendly name (SSID); and the first device receives the attribute, obtains a user

friendly name from the received attribute and displays the user-friendly name (page 13 -

display SSID at user laptop computer). Similarly, this would read on claims 6-11 and

14-16. It is inherent that in order to display SSID at user laptop computer, another

access point of another user has to response to the scan request message.

4.   Claims 1-6, 15-16, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by admitted prior art Fleming et al. (U.S. 2003/0158952).

        As to claim 1, Fleming teaches a method for discovering the service offered by a

second device (Fig.1 , 120) using a first device (Fig.1 , 110) comprising: the first device

(Fig.1 , 110) makes a service search request ([0019]); the second device (Fig.1 , 120)

receives the service search request and sends at least a first attribute identifying a user-

friendly name ([0019] - [0021]); and the receiving, from the second device, a response

message comprising a user-friendly name for the second device ([0019] - [0021]; page

2, claim 1 - *the advertising device 120 sends back an SDP response*); and user can

select a service from the services available for connection ([0022]), hence it is inherent

that user friendly service names are displayed.

        As to claim 2, Fleming teaches the first device is an SDP client (Fig. 1, 110) and

the second device is and SDP server (Fig. 1, 120).

As to claim 3, Fleming teaches the first device is an Application Host and the second device is an Application Client ([0017]).

As to claim 4, Fleming teaches the service search request is a request relating to a first service record stored in a database of the second device (*database where service records stored in device 120 that not shown*) ([0019] - [0020]).

As to claim 5, Fleming teaches the second device sends the attributes of the requested first service record (*ServiceRecord1*) ([0020] - [0021]; page 2, claim 1).

Claims 6, 15-16 and 26-28 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Fleming teaches a memory storing computer program ([0023]), a transceiver (*transceiver not shown in I/O interface 650 of Fig. 6*) to send service search request, a memory to store user-friendly name for second device ([0022] - [0023]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 2, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kammer (US 7,356,347) in view of Isomura et al. (US 2002/0052966).

As to claim 2, Kammer does not explicitly teach the first device is a service discovery protocol client and the second device is a service discovery protocol server.

Isomura teaches the first device is a service discovery protocol client and the second device is a service discovery protocol server (Fig. 1; [0001], [0006], [0008]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of service discovery protocol into the teachings of Kammer for the purpose of discovering a service provided by an apparatus using a service discovery protocol utilizing service discovery protocol client and service discovery protocol server.

As to claim 21, Isomura teaches the service search request comprises a SDP Service Search Attribute Request message and the response message comprises a SDP Service Search Attribute Response message ([0005]).

7.   Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kammer (US 7,356,347) in view of Virtanen (US 2003/0124978).

As to claim 19, Kammer does not explicitly teach the response message comprises a service name for a service identified in the service search request.

Virtanen teaches the response message comprises a BT name response for a device specific Bluetooth addresses in the service search request (0024]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Virtanen into the teachings of Kammer for the purpose of having a user-friendly and easy to understand name instead of service identification.

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 15-16, and 19-28 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant mainly

argues that Benq and Fleming do not teach receiving a response message comprising a

user-friendly name for second device. Examiner respectfully submits that in response

to the request from the first device, the second device has to response in order for the

first device to know user friendly name of the second device / neighboring access point

and display it to user.

Conclusion

9.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

        A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to QUYNH H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-
272-7489. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30
A.M. to 5:00 P.M. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the
examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on 571-272-7488. The fax phone
number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-
273-8300.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Quynh H Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614